

United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Environmental Assessment WY-020-EA07-064

Case File Number: WYW-140131

CA7-013

Finding of No Significant Impact & Decision Record

WESCO WEST BRANCH # 1 EXPLORATORY WELL

for

Wesco Operating Inc., P.O Box 3439, Casper, WY 82602

Location: 6th Principal Meridian, T. 53 N., R. 98 W., SECTIONS 11 & 14, Park County, Wyoming.

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Cody Field Office
P.O. Box 518
Cody, WY 82901
Phone: 307-578-5900
FAX: 307-578-5939

February 6, 2008



Finding of No Significant Impact

Cody Field Office

INTRODUCTION:

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis, (EA No. WY-020-E07-064). The proposed action is for a natural gas well and access road in the McCullough Peaks area, in Park County. The proponent/applicant is, Wesco Operating Inc. The project location is, T. 53 N., R. 98 W., Sections 11 & 14.

Alternatives analyzed in detail:

- A. The Proposed Action
- B. An Alternative well location
- C. The No Action Alternative

The first alternative entails the proponent's proposal for development along with Conditions of Approval and Best Management Practices.

The second alternative entails moving the proposed well to a location closer to the Whistle Creek Road, with a shorter access road, and Best Management Practices.

The no action alternative would be to not approve this Application for Permit to Drill (APD)

The EA is available at the Cody Field Office, and is incorporated by reference for this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

PLAN CONFORMANCE AND CONSISTENCY:

The proposed action and alternatives have been reviewed and found to be in conformance with one or more of the following BLM Land Use Plans and the associated decision(s):

The Cody Resource Area, Record of Decision (ROD) and Resource Management Plan, dated November 8, 1990; page 21 of the ROD which states that, "...the planning area is open to oil and gas leasing, subject to appropriate restrictions for surface-disturbing activities."

All aspects of this project will follow timing restrictions set forth in the Cody RMP. Sage grouse nesting, brooding, rearing and wild horse foaling season are between the dates of February 1 and July 31. Pronghorn use this area for wintering and birthing habitat, but the habitat is not considered crucial.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT DETERMINATION:

Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the proposed action is not a major federal action and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. Environmental effects do not meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27 and do not exceed those effects described in the Cody RMP/FEIS. *Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed.* This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as described:

Intensity: The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27 and incorporated into BLM's Critical Elements of the Human Environment list (H-1790-1), and supplemental Instruction Memoranda, Acts, regulations and Executive Orders. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

1. **Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse.** The proposed action would impact resources as described in the EA. Those resources analyzed are: air quality, cultural resources, wastes (hazardous and solid), soil and water quality (groundwater, drinking water, and surface water), wilderness, invasive non-native species, wild horses, visual resource management, sage grouse (T&E), and paleontology. Mitigating measures to reduce impacts have been incorporated into the proposed action in the form of Conditions of Approval (COA) and/or Best Management Practices (BMPs). The COAs were incorporated as part of the proposed action and Alternative B. The BMPs are listed in Appendix A of the EA and were also part of the proposed action for Alternatives A and B.
2. **The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.** The proposed action is designed to have minimum impact on public health. Transportation of equipment to the project location will be in conformance with state and federal laws. Oil and gas regulation requirements for public safety will be met.
3. **Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.** Historic, cultural, and vertebrate and scientifically important paleontological resources in the project area have been inventoried and avoided. Potential impacts have been mitigated in the design of the proposed action an implementation of BMPs.

The following Critical Elements of the Human Environment and Other Resource Issues are not present in the project area and are not affected: areas of critical environmental concern, environmental justice, farmlands (prime or unique), flood plains, Native American religious concerns, wetlands and riparian, and wild/scenic rivers.

4. **The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** There is no scientific controversy over the nature of the impacts. Comments received from the public listed several concerns about wildlife, visual impacts, wild horses, paleontology, hazardous materials, and the quality of the environment in the McCullough Peaks area. Each one of these issues has been analyzed in the EA. The comment matrix is attached to this document and made part of the Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact (DR/FONSI).

5. **The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.** The project is not unique or unusual. The BLM has experience implementing similar actions in similar areas.

The environmental effects to the human environment are fully analyzed in the EA. There are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks

6. **The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** The actions considered in the selected alternative were considered by the interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. Complete analyses of the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the selected alternative and all other alternatives, are described in Chapter 4 of the EA.
7. **Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts – which include connected actions regardless of land ownership.** The interdisciplinary team evaluated the possible actions in context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. A complete disclosure of the effects of the project is contained in Chapter 4 of the EA.
8. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.** The project will not affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will it cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. A cultural inventory has been completed for the proposed action, and resources are being avoided. Consultation with SHPO has been completed in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA and the Programmatic Agreement between the Wyoming BLM and SHPO.
9. **The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, or the degree to which the action may adversely affect: 1) a proposed to be listed endangered or threatened species or its habitat, or 2) a species on BLM's sensitive species list.** Mitigating measures to reduce impacts to wildlife have been incorporated into the design of the proposed action. Although sage grouse, golden eagles, burrowing owls, grey wolf, long billed curlew, mountain plover, and white-tailed prairie dog species may occupy habitat within the project boundary, it has been determined that they will not be affected because of measures outlined in the COAs and BMPs which have been incorporated in the project design. No other threatened or endangered plants or animals are known to occur in the area.
10. **Whether the action threatens a violation of a federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment, where non-federal requirements are consistent with federal requirements.** The project does not violate any known federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

/s/ Duane Feick for

Michael P. Stewart
Cody Field Manager

2/06/2008

Date

Decision:

Based upon the analysis of the potential environmental impacts described in environmental assessment WY-020-EA07-064 (EA), and supporting documents in the case file, consideration of comments received during scoping and on the EA, it is my decision to issue a permit to construct a gas well and access road on BLM-administered public lands, as described in the proposed action alternative (Alternative A) with integration of COAs and BMPs. Technical considerations relating to hitting the target structure also result in the selection of the company's proposal. In addition, Alternative B would impact viewing opportunities from the Whistle Creek Road, which is a main artery for recreationists in the area.

Authorities: The authority for this decision is contained in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, and Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.

Compliance and Monitoring: A BLM representative will be conducting compliance monitoring during all facets of well construction and operations.

Project Design Features / Terms / Conditions / Stipulations: Standard stipulations will apply. All aspects of this project will follow timing restrictions set forth in the Cody RMP. Sage grouse nesting, brooding, rearing and wild horse foaling season are between the dates of February 1 and July 31. Pronghorn use this area for wintering and birthing habitat, but this habitat is not considered crucial. In addition, COAs built into the project design and the addition of BMPs incorporated as part of the proposed action and can be viewed in Appendix A of the EA.

Rationale for Decision: This decision is based on the FONSI, and is in accordance with policy, 43 CFR § 3000 and Onshore Order Number One (1).

In addition, the decision conforms with the Cody Resource Management Plan, (Record of Decision (ROD), 1990), which allows oil and gas exploration in the entire administrative unit, with the exception of the McCullough Peaks Wilderness Study Area (WSA) which is approximately 6 miles southwest of the proposed project.

All aspects of this project will follow timing restrictions set forth in the Cody RMP. Sage grouse nesting, brooding, rearing and wild horse foaling season are between the dates of February 1 and July 31. Pronghorn use this area for wintering and birthing habitat, but the habitat is not considered crucial.

A public scoping session was not held, but this document was posted for a 30-day comment period on the BLM NEPA website. The comment period began July 26, 2007, and ended on August 26, 2007.

Public comments have been incorporated into the DR/FONSI and are made a part of this decision (Appendix A).

Applications for permit to drill (APDs) are made available to the public for comment for 30 days from the date that they were received. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department was given an opportunity to comment on this project.

The BLM contacted the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) as to cultural resources in the project area. A Class III cultural resource inventory was conducted for the project area.

Changes Made as a Result of Public Comment: Comments received, and the BLM response on the Draft EA are located in Appendix A, and are made part of this DR/FONSI.

Appeals Language: This decision is in full force and effect upon the date it is signed by the authorized officer and will remain in effect while any appeal is pending unless the Interior Board of Land Appeals issues a stay pursuant to 43 CFR 3150.2. Any appeal of this decision must follow the procedures set forth in 43 CFR Part 4. Within 30 days of the decision, a notice of appeal must be filed in the office of the authorized officer at the Cody Field Office, 1002 Blackburn Avenue, P.O. Box 518, Cody, WY 82414. If a statement of reasons for the appeal is not included with the notice, it must be filed with the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of Hearings and Appeals, U.S. Department of the Interior, 801 North Quincy St., Suite 300, Arlington, VA 22203 within 30 days after the notice of appeal is filed with the authorized officer.

To file a petition for stay pursuant to 43 CFR Part 4.21(b), it must accompany your notice of appeal and must show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,
- (3) The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted, and
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

If a petition for stay is submitted with the notice of appeal, a copy of the notice of appeal and petition for stay must be served on each party named in the decision from which the appeal is taken, and with the IBLA at the same time it is filed with the authorized officer.

A copy of the notice of appeal, any statement of reasons and all pertinent documents must be served on each adverse party named in the decision from which the appeal is taken and on the Office of the Regional Solicitor, Rocky Mountain Region, 755 Parfet Street, Suite 151, Lakewood, CO 80215, not later than 15 days after filing the document with the authorized officer and/or IBLA.

/s/ Duane Feick for
Michael P. Stewart
Cody Field Manager

2/06/2008
Date

Attachments (1):

1 – Appendix A, Comment matrix to the EA

APPENDIX A – PUBLIC COMMENTS ON EA

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
<i>1/Biodiversity Conservation Alliance (BCA)</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Minerals</i>	<i>Clarify if this is an oil, gas, tight sands, etc... well.</i>	<i>This is a natural gas well. See Project Description in EA</i>
	<i>2</i>	<i>Wilderness</i>	<i>Well is located inside the area BCA has proposed for additional management (wilderness).</i>	<i>The area identified around McCullough Peaks was considered during the initial wilderness inventory in 1978. Lands were designated to be Wilderness in character and thus became our Wilderness Study Area (WSA). Other lands outside the current WSA were considered to NOT contain wilderness qualities necessary for consideration during the 1978 inventory. Today, we are still managing the area under the current Land Use Plan, the Cody, RMP (ROD signed 11/1990). We are not able to manage the lands differently from our multiple use mandates without a land use plan revision. The Cody Field Office is going to begin a land use plan amendment in 2008.</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>Minerals</i>	<i>Improve the affected environment by reflecting status of resources, pre-project implementation.</i>	<i>See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment</i>

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	4	Wilderness	BCA states that the BLM needs to take a "hard look" at wilderness in character for the area they designated inside McCullough Peaks. BCA, states that this is NEW INFORMATION, and is considered by BCA as THE most sensitive resource to be impacted by the proposed action.	We have considered another alternative in the final EA. This alternative was chosen to compare a location closer to the Whistle Creek road, and other existing disturbances. There are no assumptions for analysis and/or inconsistencies, and have attempted to eliminated guesswork.
	5	NEPA	BCA says we need an EIS to address the impacts of this project	This comment is addressed in the Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact.
	6	Minerals	Need more alternatives	Three alternatives were analyzed. The Alternative A, the proposed action, Alternative B, a well location closer to the Whistle Creek Road, and the No Action Alternative.
	7	Minerals - Recreation	Explain in more detail how "berming" will not impact the recreation experience from the north and immediate vicinity.	This is discussed in the Project Description portion of the EA; for both Alternatives A & B.
	8	Minerals - Recreation	Consider impacts not only to hunters/outfitters/wild horse enthusiast, but also to hikers, horseman, and non-motorized recreation	See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment
	9	Minerals	A) Consider directional drilling, B) consider alternative to protect wilderness characteristics	Impacts are mitigated with both Alternatives. Directional Drilling is not necessary.

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	10	Minerals	Clarify Cultural Resource Inventory Results, define Class III - as pedestrian, on-foot transects of the project area, after a Class I literature search has been conducted. .	See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment
	11	Paleontology	A) ADD information on paleontological resources in project area. B) Discuss surveys done in the general vicinity, and avoidance/measures.	See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment
	12	Minerals	H2S: Discuss impact to plants, wildlife, and recreationists. Include contingency plan as an appendix to the EA.	See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment
	13	Wildlife	A) More discussion of sage grouse, well proximity to lek, and effects. B) more discussion on # of raptor nests within 2 miles of well and effects.	See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment
	14	Minerals - Wilderness	BCA's statement: "high standard road and industrial well site will be built in a road less area....effectively converts an undeveloped landscape (recommended for wilderness) to an industrial landscape."	Alternatives A and B are located in an area that currently has the following intrusions present: a pipeline access point facility, a buried underground gas pipeline, the Whistle Creek Road, pipeline markers, two-track trails, and another existing gas well north of the project area.

Letter/Number/Commenter	Comment #	Comment Type	Comment	BLM Response
	15	NEPA	Convincing statement and reasons why impacts are NOT SIGNIFICANT and how the BLM can get to a FONSI	Alternatives A & B, both contain mitigative elements for the majority of the visual impacts. There will still be some visual intrusion, but combined with the existing pipeline, pipeline facilities, and major upgraded road, and gas well, we do not consider impacts from the proposed well to be out of keeping of the current land uses.
	16	NEPA	If agency cannot definitively say significant impacts will not occur, an EIS is required.	We do not consider the implementation of the proposed action, Alternative A, to be a significant impact.
	17	NEPA	USFS, Medicine Bow - Routt, did an EIS in a "road less area". For BLM - Cody to not undertake a similar type analysis is arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Rules Act - BCA suggests an independent study for feasibility of directional drilling.	We do not consider the project area to be a "road less" area. We have considered the resource elements and will institute best management practices for the authorized facility.
	18	Minerals	A) List out all well locations that were considered (range of alternatives), B) list out all appropriate mitigation measures (closed mud system etc...), C) per BCA, BLM cannot limit scope of analysis because of applicants finances and minimum costs.	A) See Chapter 2 - Alternatives, B) see Chapter 2 - Alternatives, C) According to NEPA § 1505.2 (b), "...an agency may discuss preferences among alternatives based on relevant factors including economic and technical considerations.
	19	Minerals	BMPs - List ALL those appropriate for this action	See Appendix A - Best Management Practices
	20	Minerals	Alternative well siting - discuss new location	See Chapter 2 - Alternatives

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	21	Minerals	Directional drilling feasible? Outside BCA's proposed wilderness, explain new location, pull in MTP and HI information	See Chapter 2, Alternatives
	22	Minerals	"S" Turn Directional Drilling - consider	Impacts are mitigated with both Alternatives. Directional Drilling is not necessary.
	23	Minerals	New well siting, list all available measures to minimize impact in citizens proposed wilderness, also: A) is it possible to allow only a 2 track road to the well?, B) use of wooden mats on access road and well location?, C) Pit less Drilling, D) Off-site location of compression, dehydrating, and condensate storage facilities?, E) When plugged and abandoned, consider "grade level" markers rather than a pole that sticks up.	See project description. The BMPs require minimum, but all necessary structure and engineering.

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	24	Wildlife & SSS	<p>A) mere mitigation measures are not enough and must be backed up/supported by mitigation measures by assertion of compliance and monitoring, B) again, range of alternative and mitigation measures to discuss things like facilities not creating raptor perches, etc C) INCORPORATE comments from Fish and Game, D) Need to discuss not only seasonal restrictions, but also what continued activity at the completed well site would to impact sage grouse, E) Seasonal restrictions, do not prevent the industrialization of key sage grouse nesting habitats within 3 miles of a lek site - per Halloran 2005, study on SG impacts post drilling/post construction phase & Braun: recommends 3 mile radius around leks, with 0 roads, wells, and infrastructure.</p>	<p>A) Compliance monitoring will be conducted, B) See Chapter 2 - Alternatives, C) Fish and Game did not have any comments for this proposal, D) there is no suitable nesting habitat or winter range for sage grouse in the project area. See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment, E) Again, the well location does not have nesting or winter habitat - marginal use by sage grouse any time of the year.</p>
	25	NEPA	<p>BCA refers to BLM prop. Mitigation measures on Atlantic Rim and whether or not these are effective.</p>	<p>We have appropriate mitigation measures in the form of the Best Management Practices.</p>
	26	Wildlife	<p>Explain why we are allowing construction within the 2-mile radius of a lek, but outside the seasonal restrictions.</p>	<p>We are not allowing construction inside the 2-mile radius - this well is outside even the 3-mile radius.</p>

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	27	Wildlife	ADD - more information/mitigation measures for grouse wintering?	There is currently no specific delineation for sage grouse wintering in the Cody GIS database. However, BLM biologists looked the at project area and found no suitable winter range for sage grouse.
	28	Wildlife	Buffer zones for raptor nests - consider a larger area?	The closest known raptor nest is over 3 miles from the proposed well location. Larger buffer zones have no bearing for this well.
	29	NEPA	BLM has: A) put together a very cursory analysis, B) does not constitute a hard look, C) Numerous important resources impacted, D) BCA says if project moves forward as proposed, the BLM cannot reach a FONSI.	An EA was prepared according to regulations. An EA assists the agency in evaluating whether or not an EIS or a FONSI should be done. The procedural requirements have been followed in good faith, and the resulting decision is well-reasoned and based on full and appropriate disclosure of environmental impacts. The Final EA was prepared after public comment; and comments and additional analysis were incorporated.
	30	TEAM	"We urge the BLM to approve the project only after significant alterations to protect the road less & wilderness qualities found in the project area, as well as the sensitive wildlife that inhabits the area."	This project will be approved with Best Management Practices applied.
2/Ron Vironda	1	Minerals	Recent improvements at Bridger 2A well are good, but concerned about West Branch being a second mess.	The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	2	Minerals	<i>Suggest monitoring and penalties to prevent this site to become another "mess"</i>	<i>The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.</i>
	3	TEAM	<i>Prefer ZERO oil and gas in McCullough Peaks, but that if it has to be done, to do it responsibly.</i>	<i>We are mandated to authorize oil and gas activities in a responsible manner. The area in McCullough Peaks is currently leased by Wesco and the Bill Barrett Corporation.</i>
	4	TEAM	<i>Attain balance between resources and preservation of environment.</i>	<i>We are mandated to authorize oil and gas activities in a responsible manner.</i>
3/Neil & Jennifer Miller	1	Wilderness	<i>Concerned that well is inside BCA's proposed wilderness - deserves protection</i>	<i>Because the project area already has visual and physical intrusions such as, a buried pipeline, a pipeline access facility, an upgraded crowned and ditched road, pipeline markers, and an existing gas well, this use is similar to those uses already in place.</i>
	2	TEAM	<i>Oil and gas will spoil the feeling of the area</i>	<i>Same as above.</i>
	3	TEAM	<i>Feel that the BLM should undertake a "full scale EIS to assess the role that this area (McCullough Peaks) should play for the people of the Bighorn Basin.</i>	<i>An EIS is not required for this APD. We are able to mitigate the effects of the proposal.</i>
	4	Wildlife	<i>Would like to see NO Special exemptions on seasonal restrictions for sage grouse</i>	<i>BLM agrees with this in areas where sage grouse restrictions are appropriate, the restrictions are applied.</i>

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
4/Linda Raynolds	1	TEAM	Primary concerns are: Wildlife and Recreation values and Long Term industrialization of McCullough Peaks	The long-term management goals for the McCullough Peaks area will be re- analyzed in the upcoming Bighorn Basin RMP revision. This kind of analysis is out of scope for the proposed Wesco West Branch #1 well and access road.
	2	TEAM	Suggest a "plan in place to protect all other resources in recognition of increased interest in industrialization."	The long-term management goals for the McCullough Peaks area will be re- analyzed in the upcoming Bighorn Basin RMP revision. This kind of analysis is out of scope for the proposed Wesco West Branch #1 well and access road.
	3	TEAM	Suggest the BLM re-think "agenda" on McCullough Peaks and make it a priority to protect natural values - as the Highest priority	The long-term management goals for the McCullough Peaks area will be re- analyzed in the upcoming Bighorn Basin RMP revision. This kind of analysis is out of scope for the proposed Wesco West Branch #1 well and access road.
	4	TEAM	Commenter would also like the BLM to close and withdraw McCullough Peaks from oil and gas and future leasing.	The long-term management goals for the McCullough Peaks area will be re- analyzed in the upcoming Bighorn Basin RMP revision. This kind of analysis is out of scope for the proposed Wesco West Branch #1 well and access road.

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	5	Minerals	<i>Refers to Wesco being "out of compliance on 2 other wells in our area". They should be in compliance with other 2 wells before allowing this one. Fine company or shutdown other wells.</i>	<i>The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.</i>
	6	TEAM	<i>"BLM should institute a policy of applicants/operators/permit holders to engage in restoration projects in McCullough Peaks: wildlife habitat enhancement, VRM mitigation/enhancement, Dust abatement, Weed abatement/control</i>	<i>We do not have a Land Use Plan decision that would require this type of policy.</i>
	7	TEAM	<i>BLM is incrementally, "degrading landscape as if it were a limitless resource."</i>	<i>Thank you for your comment</i>
5/Ada Inbody	1	TEAM	<i>Supports NO ACTION alternative</i>	<i>Thank you for your comment</i>
	2	Minerals	<i>Use and Enforce BMPs</i>	<i>The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.</i>
	3	Minerals	<i>Are "containment berms adequate to handle spills".</i>	<i>Yes. Berms and mounds are used interchangeably in the EA. Berms referred to in the EA are "mounds" of soil that will be built and placed strategically to shield the well and facilities from view. In addition, containment berms/mounds are sufficient to handle spill per oil and gas requirements.</i>

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	4	Minerals	H2S: Are escape routes marked? Is/will this be safe for recreationists? Example: Oregon Basin is no longer an area to recreate in.	Escape routes are marked on the well pad for H2S for the crew. If H2S becomes a problem, the operator is required to submit a public protection plan.
	5	VRM	Gravel/aggregate on Whistle Creek Road and at Whistle Creek Road and junction of Hwy does not blend with landscape - should use a different color of gravel than what comes out of "Windy Flats" gravel pit.	We will be requiring gravel on the access road. We do suggest "pit run" or other aggregate taken from construction of the well/access road, so that it will blend.
6/Bettye Dominick	1	Minerals	Bring Wesco into compliance and applauds staff for starting rehabilitation efforts on Bridger 2A.	Thank you for your comment
	2	Minerals -	Suggest not to issue new permit to Wesco until reserve pit (Bridger 2A) has been fixed - enforce fines and penalties.	Thank you for your comment
	3	TEAM	Suggest the following mitigation measures: A) No travel with heavy equipment on wet roadways, B) Impact area condensed from 5.14 acres to 3 acres or less	It is a standard operating procedure that traffic is not allowed on access roads if rutting is greater than 3-4 inches in soil depth. The pad will be ~3.5 acres in size - please see project description.
	4	TEAM	Suggest company does off-site mitigation on roads, trails, signs, clean water reservoirs, test water quality, etc...	We do not have a Land Use Planning decision to require this kind of off-site mitigation.
	5	Minerals	Emphasize compliance: Companies are not called to task for non-compliance and BLM needs to monitor daily.	The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	6	TEAM	Consider view shed for: historic Bridger trail, prehistoric sites, and paleontological sites	There are no known prehistoric sites within the project area. A Class III cultural resource inventory was completed for this project. While paleontological resources are abundant in McCullough Peaks, the overburden (soil) is so deep that is suspect that nothing will be encountered. As for the Historic Bridger trail, the well, is 2.5 west of the trail.
	7	TEAM	OPEN SPACE: "The Cody Office Has an opportunity and obligation to keep rigs, traffic, pollution, unsightly tanks, and other oil field garbage out of this area."	The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.
	8	TEAM	Supports NO ACTION alternative	Thank you for your comment
7/FOAL	1	TEAM	Feel that the EA should be "redrafted" to better protect habitat and to ensure better stewardship of the land and resources A) mitigation and monitoring NOT specific enough to ensure protection or recreation, range, watershed, wildlife, wilderness, natural, and scenic values. B) Wesco poor track record (Polecat Bench/Bridger 2A) - suggest not giving Wesco another permit until the other two are fixed.	The BLM will conduct compliance and monitoring activities at this well site.

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	2	Minerals	Move well out of line of sight of Gilmore Hill - also give consideration to the Whistle Creek drainage from WSA to west.	The majority of Alternatives A & B will not be visible from Gilmore Hill.
	3	Minerals	More description of proposed project - berming to create visual block, tank height, color, etc - and specify monitoring and enforcement procedures.	See Chapter 2 - Alternatives
	4	Minerals	Require full reseeding of pad and disturbed area	See Chapter 2 - Alternatives
	5	Minerals	Require reserve pit to be rehabbed within 90 days of completion.	This is consistent with current policy.
	6	Minerals	Need more discussion on when not to use the wet roads - Wesco could lock a gate in extreme weather, or help the BLM monitor road conditions	It is a standard operating procedure that traffic is not allowed on access roads if rutting is greater than 3-4 inches in soil depth. The pad and access road will result in 3.8 acres of new disturbance- please see project description.
	7	TEAM	Require Wesco to conduct off-site mitigation, rehab work on old roads, rails. More of a "Good Neighbor" policy.	We do not have a Land Use Plan decision that would require off-site mitigation for this type of action.
	8	Recreation	Discuss recreation statistics for the area	See Chapter 3 - Affected Environment
	9	Minerals/NEPA	Past actions should be discussed in more detail - Bridger 2A & Red Point Seismic	See Chapter 4 - Cumulative Effects

<i>Letter/Number/Commenter</i>	<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment Type</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>BLM Response</i>
	10	Management	REQUEST additional public comment period for 30 days and a public hearing.	We will not hold a public hearing for this project - a hearing is a formal procedure that requires a court recorder and testimony. That is out of scope for this project.